

June 29, 2006

**CEQA Initial Study - Environmental Checklist Form  
(Based on the State CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G Rev. 10/04)**

1. Project Number(s)/Environmental Log Number/Title:  
  
GPA 06-008, Log No. 06-00-002; County of San Diego Noise Element Update
2. Lead agency name and address:  
County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use  
5201 Ruffin Road, Suite B,  
San Diego, CA 92123-1666
3.
  - a. Contact Joseph Farace, Project Manager
  - b. Phone number: (858) 694-3690
  - c. E-mail: [joseph.farace@sdcounty.ca.gov](mailto:joseph.farace@sdcounty.ca.gov).
4. Project location:  
  
The County of San Diego is located in Southern California bordered on the west by the Pacific Ocean, to the east by Imperial County, to the north by Orange and Riverside Counties, and to the south by Mexico. The project covers all unincorporated portions of the County of San Diego over which the County has land use jurisdiction.
5. Project Sponsor's name and address:  
  
County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use  
5201 Ruffin Road, Suite B  
San Diego, CA 92123
6. General Plan Designation : Various
7. Zoning: Various

8. Project Description: The County of San Diego General Plan Noise Elements contains Policy 4b. The intent of the policy is to protect public health and welfare by requiring standards for impacts from ambient noise conditions above exterior Community Noise Equivalent Levels (CNEL) of 60 decibels (dB[A]) and/or interior CNEL above 45 dB(A). The County of San Diego General Plan Noise Element, Policy 4b addresses noise sensitive uses and requires an acoustical study to be prepared for any use that may expose noise sensitive uses to noise in excess of a CNEL of 60 dB(A). Moreover, if the project is in excess of CNEL 60 dB(A), modifications must be made to project to reduce noise levels. Noise sensitive areas include residences, hospitals, schools, libraries or a similar facility where quiet is an important attribute.

The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clarify language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses. The proposed language adds specificity to the County's interpretation of the Noise Element as it applies to land use projects. The update to the Noise Element provides more well-defined guidance for the protection of noise sensitive land uses, providing improved direction to staff and County clients. The primary purpose of the Noise Element update is to better identify exterior noise sensitive areas. The Noise Element update provides for no change to the interior or exterior noise limits. Updates to the General Plan Noise Element would not affect the County Noise Ordinance which pertains mainly to on-site generated noise sources. This is the first amendment to the County Noise Element for the year 2006.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting (Briefly describe the project's surroundings):

While 18 incorporated cities lie within the County, the majority of the land (approximately 2,300,000 acres) within the County is unincorporated. Private land ownership accounts for approximately 36% of the County's unincorporated lands. Public land ownership accounts for approximately 64% of the County's unincorporated lands. For purposes of this document public land consists of land either held or managed by County, State, or Federal entities.

The County terrain varies from west to east, sloping up from the ocean, transitioning to rolling hills and then steep mountains that finally give way to flat and gently sloping deserts. The County is a generally semi-arid environment and supports a wide range of habitats and biological communities. These habitats and communities range from grasslands and shrublands to coniferous forests and desert habitats. Additionally, these habitats and communities vary greatly depending on the ecoregion, soils and substrate, elevation and topography.

The urban areas of the County are predominantly in the west, either surrounding the City of San Diego, or interspersed between the City of San Diego and the cities in Orange and Riverside Counties. Further east, the land is primarily undeveloped, with the largest developed area in the eastern portion of the County being the community of Borrego Springs. Most areas that have been

developed in the eastern portion of the County have been predominantly developed in a rural fashion, with large lot sizes, agricultural or related uses, and have limited infrastructure and service availability.

The County is serviced by Interstates 5, 15, 163, and 805 that all run north and south throughout the western portion of the County and Interstate 8 that runs east and west throughout the southern portion of the County. Additionally, the County is serviced by State Highways 67 and 79 that both run north and south throughout the western and eastern sides of the County and State Highways 76, 78 and 94 that all run east and west across the County.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement): None

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:** The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project and involve at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" or a "Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated," as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- |  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Aesthetics</a>                      | <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Agriculture Resources</a>              | <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Air Quality</a>              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Biological Resources</a>            | <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Cultural Resources</a>                 | <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Geology &amp; Soils</a>      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Hazards &amp; Haz. Materials</a>    | <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Hydrology &amp; Water Quality</a>      | <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Land Use &amp; Planning</a>  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Mineral Resources</a>               | <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Noise</a>                              | <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Population &amp; Housing</a> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Public Services</a>                 | <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Recreation</a>                         | <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Transportation/Traffic</a>   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Utilities &amp; Service Systems</a> | <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Mandatory Findings of Significance</a> |   |

**DETERMINATION:** (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- ☒ On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning and Land Use finds that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning and Land Use finds that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning and Land Use finds that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

Joseph Farace  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name

\_\_\_\_\_  
June 29, 2006

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Land Use/Environmental Planner  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Title

## **INSTRUCTIONS ON EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. “Potential Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
  - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
  - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
  - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. The explanation of each issue should identify:
  - a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
  - b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

**I. AESTHETICS** -- Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** Scenic vistas are singular vantage points that offer unobstructed views of valued viewsheds, including areas designated as official scenic vistas along major highways or County designated visual resources. The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses. Therefore, the proposed project will not have any substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** State scenic highways refer to those highways that are officially designated. A scenic highway is officially designated as a State scenic highway when the local jurisdiction adopts a scenic corridor protection program, applies to the California Department of Transportation for scenic highway approval, and receives notification from CalTrans that the highway has been designated as an official Scenic Highway. The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses. The General Plan Amendment will not affect existing historical buildings but rather would be applied to new development. Therefore, the proposed project will not have any substantial adverse effect on a scenic resource within a State scenic highway.

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project does not propose any visible alterations to the visual environment, including landform modification or construction. The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses. Therefore, the project will not alter the existing visual character or quality of the project site and surrounding area.

- d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses. Therefore the project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views.

**II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES** -- In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:

- a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior

noise standards for noise sensitive land uses. Therefore, no Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide or Farmland of Local Importance will be converted to a non-agricultural use.

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses. Therefore, the project does not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract.

c) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses. Therefore, no Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide, or Farmland of Local Importance will be converted to a non-agricultural use.

**III. AIR QUALITY** -- Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the San Diego Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) or applicable portions of the State Implementation Plan (SIP)?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |



Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** Operation of the project will not result in emissions of significant quantities of criteria pollutants listed in the California Ambient Air Quality Standards or toxic air contaminants as identified by the California Air Resources Board. The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses. Therefore, the project will not conflict or obstruct with the implementation of the RAQS nor the SIP on a project or cumulative level.

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact

☐ Less than Significant Impact

☐ Potentially Significant Unless  
Mitigation Incorporated

☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

In general, air quality impacts from land use projects are the result of emissions from motor vehicles, and from short-term construction activities associated with such projects. The San Diego County Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD) has established screening-level criteria for all new source review (NSR) in APCD Rule 20.2. For CEQA purposes, these screening-level criteria can be used as numeric methods to demonstrate that a project's total emissions (e.g. stationary and fugitive emissions, as well as emissions from mobile sources) would not result in a significant impact to air quality. Since APCD does not have screening-level criteria for emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs), the use of the screening level for reactive organic compounds (ROC) from the CEQA Air Quality Handbook for the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB), which has stricter standards for emissions of ROCs/VOCs than San Diego's, is appropriate. However, the eastern portions of the county have atmospheric conditions that are characteristic of the Southeast Desert Air Basin (SEDAB). SEDAB is not classified as an extreme non-attainment area for ozone and therefore has a less restrictive screening-level. Projects located in the eastern portions of the County can use the SEDAB screening-level threshold for VOCs.

**No Impact:** This project does not propose any operation or activity that has the potential to emit air pollution. No increase in vehicular trips is anticipated as a result of the project. Further, there are no substantial grading operations associated with the construction of the project. The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses. As such, the project will not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.

- c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

San Diego County is presently in non-attainment for the 1-hour concentrations under the California Ambient Air Quality Standard (CAAQS) for Ozone (O<sub>3</sub>). San Diego County is also presently in non-attainment for the annual geometric mean and for the 24-hour concentrations of Particulate Matter less than or equal to 10 microns (PM<sub>10</sub>) under the CAAQS. O<sub>3</sub> is formed when volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>) react in the presence of sunlight. VOC sources include any source that burns fuels (e.g., gasoline, natural gas, wood, oil); solvents; petroleum processing and storage; and pesticides. Sources of PM<sub>10</sub> in both urban and rural areas include: motor vehicles, wood burning stoves and fireplaces, dust from construction, landfills, agriculture, wildfires, brush/waste burning, and industrial sources of windblown dust from open lands.

**No Impact:** The project does not propose any construction and/or operation that have the potential to emit any criteria air pollutants. No increase in vehicular trips is anticipated as a result of the project. Further, there are no substantial grading operations associated with the construction of the project. The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses. As such, the project will not result in the in a cumulatively considerable net increase of PM<sub>10</sub>, or any O<sub>3</sub> precursors.

- d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

Air quality regulators typically define sensitive receptors as schools (Preschool-12<sup>th</sup> Grade), hospitals, resident care facilities, or daycare centers, or other facilities that may house individuals with health conditions that would be adversely impacted by changes in air quality.

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses. As such, the project will not expose sensitive populations to excessive levels of air pollutants.

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses. No potential sources of objectionable odors have been identified in association with the proposed project. As such, no impact from odors is anticipated.

**IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES** -- Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses. Therefore, no species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service would be expected to occur on-site.

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses. Therefore, there will be no substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service.

- c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses. Therefore, no impacts will occur to wetlands defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act in which the Army Corps of Engineers maintains jurisdiction over.

- d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior

noise standards for noise sensitive land uses. Therefore, impedance of the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, or established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impedance of the use of native wildlife nursery sites would not be expected as a result of the proposed project.

- e) Conflict with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses. Therefore, the project will not conflict with any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources.

**V. CULTURAL RESOURCES** -- Would the project:

- a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in 15064.5?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses. The General Plan Amendment would not affect existing historical structures. Rather it would apply to new development. Therefore, no substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in 15064.5 will occur.

- b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to 15064.5?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Mitigation Incorporated  
Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses. Therefore, no substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined in 15064.5 will occur.

- c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses. Therefore no unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature will be destroyed.

- d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses. Therefore, no human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries will be disturbed.

**VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS** -- Would the project:

- a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
- i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist

for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?  
Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses. Therefore, there will be no impact from the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from a known hazard zone as a result of this project.

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses. Therefore, there will be no impact from the exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects from strong seismic ground shaking as a result of this project.

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses. Therefore, there will be no impact from the exposure of people to adverse effects from a known area susceptible to ground failure.

iv. Landslides?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses.

c) Will the project produce unstable geological conditions that will result in adverse impacts resulting from landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses.

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?



- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses.

- e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses.

**VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS** -- Would the project:

- a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or wastes?

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                          | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses. The project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment because it does not propose the storage, use, transport, emission, or disposal of Hazardous Substances, nor are Hazardous Substances proposed or currently in use in the immediate vicinity.

- b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses. The project will not contain, handle, or store any potential sources of chemicals or compounds that would present a significant risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances.

- c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses.

- d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses.

- e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses. Therefore, the project will not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

- f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses. As a result, the project will not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

- g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

The following sections summarize the project's consistency with applicable emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans.

- i. OPERATIONAL AREA EMERGENCY PLAN:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The Operational Area Emergency Plan is a framework document that provides direction to local jurisdictions to develop specific operational area of San Diego County. It provides guidance for emergency planning and requires subsequent plans to be established by each jurisdiction that has responsibilities in a disaster situation. The project will not interfere with this plan because it will not prohibit subsequent plans from being established. The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses.

ii. SAN DIEGO COUNTY NUCLEAR POWER STATION EMERGENCY  
RESPONSE PLAN

**No Impact:** The San Diego County Nuclear Power Station Emergency Response Plan will not be interfered with by the project due to the location of the project, plant and the specific requirements of the plan. The emergency plan for the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station includes an emergency planning zone within a 10-mile radius. All land area within 10 miles of the plant is not within the jurisdiction of the unincorporated County and as such a project in the unincorporated area is not expected to interfere with any response or evacuation. The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses.

iii. OIL SPILL CONTINGENCY ELEMENT

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses.

iv. EMERGENCY WATER CONTINGENCIES ANNEX AND ENERGY SHORTAGE  
RESPONSE PLAN

**No Impact:** The Emergency Water Contingencies Annex and Energy Shortage Response Plan will not be interfered with because the project does not propose altering major water or energy supply infrastructure, such as the California Aqueduct. The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses.

v. DAM EVACUATION PLAN

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses.

- h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses. Therefore, based on project it is not anticipated that the project will expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving hazardous wildland fires.

- i) Propose a use, or place residents adjacent to an existing or reasonably foreseeable use that would substantially increase current or future resident's exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies, which are capable of transmitting significant public health diseases or nuisances?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses. Therefore, the project will not substantially increase current or future resident's exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies.

**VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY** -- Would the project:

- a) Violate any waste discharge requirements?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses. The project does not propose waste discharges that require waste discharge requirement permits, NPDES permits, or water quality certification from the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (SDRWQCB). In addition, the project does not propose any known sources of polluted runoff or land use activities that would require special site design considerations, source control Best Management Practices (BMPs) or treatment control BMPs, under the San Diego Municipal Storm Water Permit (SDRWQCB Order No. 2001-01).

- b) Is the project tributary to an already impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list? If so, could the project result in an increase in any pollutant for which the water body is already impaired?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses.

- c) Could the proposed project cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project does not propose any known sources of polluted runoff. In addition the project does not propose new storm water drainage facilities, nor does the project site contain natural drainage features that would transport runoff off-site. The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses.

- d) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses. Therefore, no impact to groundwater resources is anticipated.

- e) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project does not involve construction of new or expanded development that could alter the drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses.

- f) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project does not involve construction of new or expanded development that could alter the drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site. The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses.

- g) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

- h) **No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses. Therefore the project will not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems.

- i) Provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project does not propose any known additional sources of polluted runoff. In addition, the project does not propose new storm water drainage facilities, nor does the project site contain natural drainage features that would transport runoff off-site. The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses.



- j) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, including County Floodplain Maps?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses.

- k) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses.

- l) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses. Therefore, the project will not expose people to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding.

- m) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

i. SEICHE

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses.

ii. TSUNAMI

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses.

iii. MUDFLOW

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses.

**IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING** -- Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses. The project does not propose introducing new infrastructure such major roadways or water supply systems, or utilities to the area. Therefore, the proposed project will not significantly disrupt or divide the established community.

- b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clarify language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses. The proposed language adds specificity to the County's interpretation of the Noise Element as it applies to land use projects. The update to the Noise Element provides more well-defined guidance for the protection of noise sensitive land uses, providing improved direction to staff and County clients. The primary purpose of the Noise Element update is to better identify exterior noise sensitive areas. The Noise Element update provides for no change to the interior or exterior noise limits. Updates to the General Plan Noise Element would not affect the County Noise Ordinance which pertains mainly to on-site generated noise sources. Therefore, the proposed General Plan Amendment would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

**X. MINERAL RESOURCES** -- Would the project:

- a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses.

- b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses. Therefore, no potentially significant loss of availability of a known mineral resource or locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan will occur as a result of this project.

**XI. NOISE** -- Would the project result in:

- a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The Noise Element of the County of San Diego General Plan establishes limitations on sound levels to be received by noise sensitive areas (NSAs). New development may cause an existing NSA to be affected by noise caused by the new development, or it may create or locate a NSA in such a place that it is affected by noise. The Noise Element identifies airports and traffic on public roadways as the major sources of noise.

Due to the human health and quality of life concerns Federal, State, and local agencies have established limits for community noise and occupational noise. These allowable sound level limits are established based on psycho-acoustical and health considerations as well as socioeconomic and technical considerations. The County of San Diego has two principal noise regulations, the Noise Element of the General Plan and the Noise Ordinance.

Data shows that long exposure to noise levels exceeding 75 dB can result in hearing loss and other health-related problems. From a quality of life standpoint, noise can interfere with speech, disturb sleep and cause annoyance. Studies demonstrate that approximately four percent (4%) of a community is highly annoyed by community noise levels equivalent to 55 dB CNEL, and about fifteen percent (15%) of a community can be highly annoyed by community noise levels equivalent to 65dB CNEL. Additionally,

an increase in the ambient noise level can cause quality of life impacts even when the absolute noise level does not exceed 55-65 dB CNEL.

The Noise Element states that, whenever possible, NSAs should not be subjected to noise in excess of CNEL equal to 55 decibels. If it appears that 60 dB CNEL would be exceeded, an acoustical study is required. If that study confirms that greater than 60 dB CNEL would be experienced, the new development should not be approved unless either: (a) modifications are made which reduce exterior noise to less than 60 dB CNEL; or (b) if (a) is technologically infeasible, then modifications must be made to reduce interior noise levels to below 45 dB CNEL and a finding must be made that social or economic considerations warrant project approval. Development is defined as any physical development including but not limited to residences, commercial or industrial facilities, roads, civic buildings, hospitals, schools and airports. A NSA is defined as the building site of any residence, hospital, school, library, or similar facility where quiet is an important attribute of the environment.

The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clarify language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses. Such changes would better define group and private usable areas by better identifying noise sensitive uses. The proposed language adds specificity to the County's interpretation of the Noise Element as it applies to land use projects. The update to the Noise Element provides more well-defined guidance for the protection of noise sensitive land uses, providing improved direction to staff and County clients. The primary purpose of the Noise Element update is to better identify exterior noise sensitive areas. The Noise Element update provides for no change to the interior or exterior noise limits. Updates to the General Plan Noise Element would not affect the County Noise Ordinance which pertains mainly to on-site generated noise sources.

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact  
☐ Potentially Significant Unless  
Mitigation Incorporated

- ☐ Less than Significant Impact  
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses. The project does not propose any of the following land uses that can be impacted by groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

1. Buildings where low ambient vibration is essential for interior operation, including research and manufacturing facilities with special vibration constraints.

2. Residences and buildings where people normally sleep including hotels, hospitals, residences and where low ambient vibration is preferred.
3. Civic and institutional land uses including schools, churches, libraries, other institutions, and quiet office where low ambient vibration is preferred.
4. Concert halls for symphonies or other special use facilities where low ambient vibration is preferred.

Also, the project does not propose any major, new or expanded infrastructure such as mass transit, highways or major roadways or intensive extractive industry that could generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels on-site or in the surrounding area.

Therefore, the project will not expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels on a project or cumulative level.

- c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** Due to the human health and quality of life concerns Federal, State, and local agencies have established limits for community noise and occupational noise. These allowable sound level limits are established based on psycho-acoustical and health considerations as well as socioeconomic and technical considerations. The County of San Diego has two principal noise regulations, the Noise Element of the General Plan and the Noise Ordinance.

Data shows that long exposure to noise levels exceeding 75 dB can result in hearing loss and other health-related problems. From a quality of life standpoint, noise can interfere with speech, disturb sleep and cause annoyance. Studies demonstrate that approximately four percent (4%) of a community is highly annoyed by community noise levels equivalent to 55 dB CNEL, and about fifteen percent (15%) of a community can be highly annoyed by community noise levels equivalent to 65dB CNEL. Additionally, an increase in the ambient noise level can cause quality of life impacts even when the absolute noise level does not exceed 55-65 dB CNEL.

The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clarify language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses. The proposed language adds specificity to the County's interpretation of the Noise Element as it applies to land use projects. The update to the Noise Element provides more well-defined guidance for the protection of noise sensitive land uses, providing improved direction to staff and County clients. The primary purpose of the Noise

Element update is to better identify exterior noise sensitive areas. The Noise Element update provides for no change to the interior or exterior noise limits. Updates to the General Plan Noise Element would not affect the County Noise Ordinance which pertains mainly to on-site generated noise sources.

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clarify language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses. The proposed language more accurately reflects the County's past interpretation of the Noise Element as it applies to land use projects. The update to the Noise Element provides more well-defined guidance for the protection of noise sensitive land uses, providing improved direction to staff and County clients. The primary purpose of the Noise Element update is to better identify exterior noise sensitive areas. The Noise Element update provides for no change to the interior or exterior noise limits. Updates to the General Plan Noise Element would not affect the County Noise Ordinance which pertains mainly to on-site temporary and periodic generated noise sources.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clarify language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses. The proposed language more accurately reflects the County's past interpretation of the Noise Element as it applies to land use projects. The update to the Noise Element provides more well-defined guidance for the protection of noise sensitive land uses, providing improved direction to staff and County clients. The primary purpose of the Noise Element update is to better identify exterior noise sensitive areas. The Noise Element update provides for no change to the interior or exterior noise limits.

Updates to the General Plan Noise Element would not affect the County Noise Ordinance which pertains mainly to on-site (including airports) generated noise sources.

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clarify language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses. The proposed language more accurately reflects the County's past interpretation of the Noise Element as it applies to land use projects. The update to the Noise Element provides more well-defined guidance for the protection of noise sensitive land uses, providing improved direction to staff and County clients. The primary purpose of the Noise Element update is to better identify exterior noise sensitive areas. The Noise Element update provides for no change to the interior or exterior noise limits. Updates to the General Plan Noise Element would not affect the County Noise Ordinance which pertains mainly to on-site generated noise sources.

**XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING** -- Would the project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project will not induce substantial population growth in an area because the project does not propose any physical or regulatory change that would remove a restriction to or encourage population growth in an area including, but limited to the following: new or extended infrastructure or public facilities; new commercial or industrial facilities; large-scale residential development; accelerated conversion of homes to commercial or multi-family use; or regulatory changes including General Plan amendments, specific plan amendments, zone reclassifications, sewer or water annexations; or LAFCO annexation actions. Rather, the project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element



Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses.

- b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses. Therefore the displacement of substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing will not occur.

- c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses. The proposed project will not displace a substantial number of people since the site is currently vacant.

### **XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES**

- a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

- i. Fire protection?
- ii. Police protection?
- iii. Schools?
- iv. Parks?

v. Other public facilities?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses. Therefore, the project will not have an adverse physical effect on the environment because the project does not require new or significantly altered services or facilities to be constructed.

#### **XIV. RECREATION**

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses. The project does not propose any residential use, included but not limited to a residential subdivision, mobilehome park, or construction for a single-family residence that may increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities in the vicinity.

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses. The project does not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, the construction or expansion of recreational facilities cannot have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

**XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC** -- Would the project:

- a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses. The project does not propose any additional ADTs; therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system.

- b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County congestion management agency and/or as identified by the County of San Diego Transportation Impact Fee Program for designated roads or highways?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses. The project does not propose any additional ADTs; therefore, the proposed project will have no direct or cumulative impact

on the level of service standard established by the County congestion management agency for designated roads or highways.

- c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses. The proposed project is located outside of an Airport Master Plan Zone and is not adjacent to any public or private airports; therefore, the project will not result in a change in air traffic patterns.

- d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses. The proposed project will not alter traffic patterns, roadway design, or place incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) on existing roadways.

- e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses.

f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** No on-site or off-site parking is required or proposed. The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses. Thus, parking will not result in an insufficient capacity on-site or off-site.

g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses. The implementation will not result in any construction or new road design features; therefore, will not conflict with policies regarding alternative transportation.

**XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS** -- Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses. Therefore, the project will not exceed any wastewater treatment requirements.

- b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact

☐ Less than Significant Impact

☐ Potentially Significant Unless  
Mitigation Incorporated

☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses. The project does not include new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities. In addition, the project does not require the construction or expansion of water or wastewater treatment facilities.

- c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact

☐ Less than Significant Impact

☐ Potentially Significant Unless  
Mitigation Incorporated

☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses. Therefore, the project will not require any construction of new or expanded facilities, which could cause significant environmental effects.

- d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact  
☐ Potentially Significant Unless  
Mitigation Incorporated

- ☐ Less than Significant Impact  
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses.

- e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact  
☐ Potentially Significant Unless  
Mitigation Incorporated

- ☐ Less than Significant Impact  
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses.

- f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact  
☐ Potentially Significant Unless  
Mitigation Incorporated

- ☐ Less than Significant Impact  
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses. The project will not generate any solid waste nor place any burden on the existing permitted capacity of any landfill or transfer station within San Diego County.

- g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact  
☐ Potentially Significant Unless  
Mitigation Incorporated

- ☐ Less than Significant Impact  
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to the County Noise Element. The General Plan Amendment would serve to clean-up existing language contained within the existing Noise Element Policy 4b pertaining to interior and exterior noise standards for noise sensitive land uses. Therefore, compliance with any Federal, State, or local statutes or regulation related to solid waste is not applicable to this project.

**XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:**

- a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact  
☐ Potentially Significant Unless  
Mitigation Incorporated

- ☐ Less than Significant Impact  
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory were considered in the response to each question in sections IV and V of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the projects potential for significant cumulative effects. There is no substantial evidence that there are biological or cultural resources that are affected or associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

- b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?



- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse cumulative effects were considered in the response to each question in sections I through XVI of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the projects potential for incremental effects that are cumulatively considerable. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that there are cumulative effects associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

- c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

In the evaluation of environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse direct or indirect impacts to human beings were considered in the response to certain questions in sections I. Aesthetics, III. Air Quality, VI. Geology and Soils, VII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials, VIII Hydrology and Water Quality XI. Noise, XII. Population and Housing, and XV. Transportation and Traffic. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that there are adverse effects on human beings associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

## **XVIII. REFERENCES USED IN THE COMPLETION OF THE INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST**

All references to Federal, State and local regulation are available on the Internet. For Federal regulation refer to <http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/>. For State regulation refer to [www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov). For County regulation refer to [www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com). All other references are available upon request.

### **AESTHETICS**

California Street and Highways Code [California Street and Highways Code, Section 260-283.  
(<http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/>)

California Scenic Highway Program, California Streets and Highways Code, Section 260-283.  
(<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/scpr.htm>)

County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use. The Zoning Ordinance of San Diego County. Sections 5200-5299; 5700-5799; 5900-5910, 6322-6326.  
([www.co.san-diego.ca.us](http://www.co.san-diego.ca.us))

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-73: Hillside Development Policy. ([www.co.san-diego.ca.us](http://www.co.san-diego.ca.us))

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-104: Policy and Procedures for Preparation of Community Design Guidelines, Section 396.10 of the County Administrative Code and Section 5750 et seq. of the County Zoning Ordinance. ([www.co.san-diego.ca.us](http://www.co.san-diego.ca.us))

County of San Diego, General Plan, Scenic Highway Element VI and Scenic Highway Program. ([ceres.ca.gov](http://ceres.ca.gov))

County of San Diego Light Pollution Code, Title 5, Division 9 (Sections 59.101-59.115 of the County Code of Regulatory Ordinances) as added by Ordinance No 6900, effective January 18, 1985, and amended July 17, 1986 by Ordinance No. 7155. ([www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com))

County of San Diego Wireless Communications Ordinance [San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances. ([www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com))

Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego County. (Alpine, Bonsall, Fallbrook, Julian, Lakeside, Ramona, Spring Valley, Sweetwater, Valley Center).

Federal Communications Commission, Telecommunications Act of 1996 [Telecommunications Act of 1996, Pub. LA. No. 104-104, 110 Stat. 56 (1996). (<http://www.fcc.gov/Reports/tcom1996.txt>)

Institution of Lighting Engineers, Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Light Pollution, Warwickshire, UK, 2000 (<http://www.dark-skies.org/ile-gd-e.htm>)

International Light Inc., Light Measurement Handbook, 1997. ([www.intl-light.com](http://www.intl-light.com))

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Lighting Research Center, National Lighting Product Information Program (NLPiP), Lighting Answers, Volume 7, Issue 2, March 2003. ([www.lrc.rpi.edu](http://www.lrc.rpi.edu))

US Census Bureau, Census 2000, Urbanized Area Outline Map, San Diego, CA. (<http://www.census.gov/geo/www/maps/ua2kmaps.htm>)

US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) modified Visual Management System. ([www.blm.gov](http://www.blm.gov))

US Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Visual Impact Assessment for Highway Projects.

US Department of Transportation, National Highway System Act of 1995 [Title III, Section 304. Design Criteria for the National Highway System. (<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/legregs/nhsdatoc.html>)

#### AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, "A Guide to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program," November 1994. ([www.consrv.ca.gov](http://www.consrv.ca.gov))

California Department of Conservation, Office of Land Conversion, "California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model Instruction Manual," 1997. ([www.consrv.ca.gov](http://www.consrv.ca.gov))

California Farmland Conservancy Program, 1996. ([www.consrv.ca.gov](http://www.consrv.ca.gov))

California Land Conservation (Williamson) Act, 1965. ([www.ceres.ca.gov](http://www.ceres.ca.gov), [www.consrv.ca.gov](http://www.consrv.ca.gov))

California Right to Farm Act, as amended 1996. ([www.qp.gov.bc.ca](http://www.qp.gov.bc.ca))

County of San Diego Agricultural Enterprises and Consumer Information Ordinance, 1994, Title 6, Division 3, Ch. 4. Sections 63.401-63.408. ([www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com))

County of San Diego, Department of Agriculture, Weights and Measures, "2002 Crop Statistics and Annual Report," 2002. ([www.sdcountry.ca.gov](http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov))

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service LESA System. ([www.nrcs.usda.gov](http://www.nrcs.usda.gov), [www.swcs.org](http://www.swcs.org)).

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973. ([soils.usda.gov](http://soils.usda.gov))

#### AIR QUALITY

CEQA Air Quality Analysis Guidance Handbook, South Coast Air Quality Management District, Revised November 1993. ([www.aqmd.gov](http://www.aqmd.gov))

County of San Diego Air Pollution Control District's Rules and Regulations, updated August 2003. ([www.co.san-diego.ca.us](http://www.co.san-diego.ca.us))

Federal Clean Air Act US Code; Title 42; Chapter 85 Subchapter 1. ([www4.law.cornell.edu](http://www4.law.cornell.edu))

#### BIOLOGY

California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). Southern California Coastal Sage Scrub Natural Community Conservation Planning Process Guidelines. CDFG and California Resources Agency, Sacramento, California. 1993. ([www.dfg.ca.gov](http://www.dfg.ca.gov))

County of San Diego, An Ordinance Amending the San Diego County Code to Establish a Process for Issuance of the Coastal Sage Scrub Habitat Loss Permits and Declaring the Urgency Thereof to Take Effect Immediately, Ordinance No. 8365. 1994, Title 8, Div 6, Ch. 1. Sections 86.101-86.105, 87.202.2. ([www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com))

County of San Diego, Biological Mitigation Ordinance, Ord. Nos. 8845, 9246, 1998 (new series). ([www.co.san-diego.ca.us](http://www.co.san-diego.ca.us))

County of San Diego, Implementing Agreement by and between United States Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Game and County of San Diego. County of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program, 1998.

County of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program, County of San Diego Subarea Plan, 1997.

Holland, R.R. Preliminary Descriptions of the Terrestrial Natural Communities of California. State of California, Resources Agency, Department of Fish and Game, Sacramento, California, 1986.

Memorandum of Understanding [Agreement Between United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF), San Diego County Fire Chief's Association and the Fire District's Association of San Diego County.

Stanislaus Audubon Society, Inc. v County of Stanislaus (5<sup>th</sup> Dist. 1995) 33 Cal.App.4<sup>th</sup> 144, 155-159 [39 Cal. Rptr.2d 54]. ([www.ceres.ca.gov](http://www.ceres.ca.gov))

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Environmental Laboratory.  
Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual. U.S.  
Army Corps of Engineers, Wetlands Research Program  
Technical Report Y-87-1. 1987.  
(<http://www.wes.army.mil/>)

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. America's wetlands:  
our vital link between land and water. Office of Water,  
Office of Wetlands, Oceans and Watersheds. EPA843-K-  
95-001. 1995b. ([www.epa.gov](http://www.epa.gov))

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries  
Service. Habitat Conservation Planning Handbook.  
Department of Interior, Washington, D.C. 1996.  
([endangered.fws.gov](http://endangered.fws.gov))

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries  
Service. Consultation Handbook: Procedures for  
Conducting Consultation and Conference Activities Under  
Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. Department of  
Interior, Washington, D.C. 1998. ([endangered.fws.gov](http://endangered.fws.gov))

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Environmental Assessment  
and Land Protection Plan for the Vernal Pools  
Stewardship Project. Portland, Oregon. 1997.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Vernal Pools of Southern  
California Recovery Plan. U.S. Department of Interior,  
Fish and Wildlife Service, Region One, Portland, Oregon,  
1998. ([ecos.fws.gov](http://ecos.fws.gov))

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Birds of conservation concern  
2002. Division of Migratory. 2002.  
([migratorybirds.fws.gov](http://migratorybirds.fws.gov))

#### CULTURAL RESOURCES

California Health & Safety Code. §18950-18961, State  
Historic Building Code. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Health & Safety Code. §5020-5029, Historical  
Resources. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Health & Safety Code. §7050.5, Human Remains.  
([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Native American Graves Protection and  
Repatriation Act, (AB 978), 2001. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Public Resources Code §5024.1, Register of  
Historical Resources. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Public Resources Code. §5031-5033, State  
Landmarks. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Public Resources Code. §5097-5097.6,  
Archaeological, Paleontological, and Historic Sites.  
([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Public Resources Code. §5097.9-5097.991,  
Native American Heritage. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

City of San Diego. Paleontological Guidelines. (revised)  
August 1998.

County of San Diego, Local Register of Historical Resources  
(Ordinance 9493), 2002. ([www.co.san-diego.ca.us](http://www.co.san-diego.ca.us))

Demere, Thomas A., and Stephen L. Walsh. Paleontological  
Resources San Diego County. Department of  
Paleontology, San Diego Natural History Museum. 1994.

Moore, Ellen J. Fossil Mollusks of San Diego County. San  
Diego Society of Natural history. Occasional; Paper 15.  
1968.

U.S. Code including: American Antiquities Act (16 USC  
§431-433) 1906. Historic Sites, Buildings, and Antiquities

Act (16 USC §461-467), 1935. Reservoir Salvage Act (16  
USC §469-469c) 1960. Department of Transportation Act  
(49 USC §303) 1966. National Historic Preservation Act  
(16 USC §470 et seq.) 1966. National Environmental  
Policy Act (42 USC §4321) 1969. Coastal Zone  
Management Act (16 USC §1451) 1972. National Marine  
Sanctuaries Act (16 USC §1431) 1972. Archaeological  
and Historical Preservation Act (16 USC §469-469c)  
1974. Federal Land Policy and Management Act (43 USC  
§35) 1976. American Indian Religious Freedom Act (42  
USC §1996 and 1996a) 1978. Archaeological Resources  
Protection Act (16 USC §470aa-mm) 1979. Native  
American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (25  
USC §3001-3013) 1990. Intermodal Surface  
Transportation Efficiency Act (23 USC §101, 109) 1991.  
American Battlefield Protection Act (16 USC 469k) 1996.  
([www4.law.cornell.edu](http://www4.law.cornell.edu))

#### GEOLOGY & SOILS

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines  
and Geology, California Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault  
Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997.  
([www.consrv.ca.gov](http://www.consrv.ca.gov))

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines  
and Geology, Fault-Rupture Hazard Zones in California,  
Special Publication 42, revised 1997.  
([www.consrv.ca.gov](http://www.consrv.ca.gov))

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines  
and Geology, Special Publication 117, Guidelines for  
Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California,  
1997. ([www.consrv.ca.gov](http://www.consrv.ca.gov))

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances Title 6,  
Division 8, Chapter 3, Septic Ranks and Seepage Pits.  
([www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com))

County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health,  
Land and Water Quality Division, February 2002. On-site  
Wastewater Systems (Septic Systems): Permitting  
Process and Design Criteria. ([www.sdcounty.ca.gov](http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov))

County of San Diego Natural Resource Inventory, Section 3,  
Geology.

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the  
San Diego Area, California. 1973. ([soils.usda.gov](http://soils.usda.gov))

#### HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

American Planning Association, Zoning News, "Saving  
Homes from Wildfires: Regulating the Home Ignition  
Zone," May 2001.

California Building Code (CBC), Seismic Requirements,  
Chapter 16 Section 162. ([www.buildersbook.com](http://www.buildersbook.com))

California Education Code, Section 17215 and 81033.  
([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Government Code. § 8585-8589, Emergency  
Services Act. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List. April  
1998. ([www.dtsc.ca.gov](http://www.dtsc.ca.gov))

California Health & Safety Code Chapter 6.95 and §25117  
and §25316. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Health & Safety Code § 2000-2067.  
([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Health & Safety Code. §17922.2. Hazardous  
Buildings. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Public Utilities Code, SDCRAA. Public Utilities Code, Division 17, Sections 170000-170084. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Resources Agency, "OES Dam Failure Inundation Mapping and Emergency Procedures Program", 1996. ([ceres.ca.gov](http://ceres.ca.gov))

County of San Diego, Consolidated Fire Code Health and Safety Code §13869.7, including Ordinances of the 17 Fire Protection Districts as Ratified by the San Diego County Board of Supervisors, First Edition, October 17, 2001 and Amendments to the Fire Code portion of the State Building Standards Code, 1998 Edition.

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health Community Health Division Vector Surveillance and Control. Annual Report for Calendar Year 2002. March 2003. ([www.sdcountry.ca.gov](http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov))

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. California Accidental Release Prevention Program (CalARP) Guidelines. (<http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov/>, [www.oes.ca.gov](http://www.oes.ca.gov))

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. Hazardous Materials Business Plan Guidelines. ([www.sdcountry.ca.gov](http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov))

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 3, Div 5, CH. 3, Section 35.39100.030, Wildland/Urban Interface Ordinance, Ord. No.9111, 2000. ([www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com))

Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act as amended October 30, 2000, US Code, Title 42, Chapter 68, 5121, et seq. ([www4.law.cornell.edu](http://www4.law.cornell.edu))

Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Operational Area Emergency Plan, March 2000.

Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Operational Area Energy Shortage Response Plan, June 1995.

Uniform Building Code. ([www.buildersbook.com](http://www.buildersbook.com))

Uniform Fire Code 1997 edition published by the Western Fire Chiefs Association and the International Conference of Building Officials, and the National Fire Protection Association Standards 13 &13-D, 1996 Edition, and 13-R, 1996 Edition. ([www.buildersbook.com](http://www.buildersbook.com))

#### **HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY**

American Planning Association, Planning Advisory Service Report Number 476 Non-point Source Pollution: A Handbook for Local Government

California Department of Water Resources, California Water Plan Update. Sacramento: Dept. of Water Resources State of California. 1998. ([rubicon.water.ca.gov](http://rubicon.water.ca.gov))

California Department of Water Resources, California's Groundwater Update 2003 Bulletin 118, April 2003. ([www.groundwater.water.ca.gov](http://www.groundwater.water.ca.gov))

California Department of Water Resources, Water Facts, No. 8, August 2000. ([www.dpla2.water.ca.gov](http://www.dpla2.water.ca.gov))

California Disaster Assistance Act. Government Code, § 8680-8692. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California State Water Resources Control Board, NPDES General Permit Nos. CAS000001 INDUSTRIAL ACTIVITIES (97-03-DWQ) and CAS000002 Construction Activities (No. 99-08-DWQ) ([www.swrcb.ca.gov](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov))

California Storm Water Quality Association, California Storm Water Best Management Practice Handbooks, 2003.

California Water Code, Sections 10754, 13282, and 60000 et seq. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

Colorado River Basin Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 7, Water Quality Control Plan. ([www.swrcb.ca.gov](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov))

County of San Diego Regulatory Ordinance, Title 8, Division 7, Grading Ordinance. Grading, Clearing and Watercourses. ([www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com))

County of San Diego, Groundwater Ordinance. #7994. ([www.sdcountry.ca.gov](http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov), <http://www.amlegal.com/>)

County of San Diego, Project Clean Water Strategic Plan, 2002. ([www.projectcleanwater.org](http://www.projectcleanwater.org))

County of San Diego, Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance, Ordinance Nos. 9424 and 9426. Chapter 8, Division 7, Title 6 of the San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances and amendments. ([www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com))

County of San Diego. Board of Supervisors Policy I-68. Diego Proposed Projects in Flood Plains with Defined Floodways. ([www.co.san-diego.ca.us](http://www.co.san-diego.ca.us))

Federal Water Pollution Control Act (Clean Water Act), 1972, Title 33, Ch.26, Sub-Ch.1. ([www4.law.cornell.edu](http://www4.law.cornell.edu))

Freeze, Allan and Cherry, John A., Groundwater, Prentice-Hall, Inc. New Jersey, 1979.

Heath, Ralph C., Basic Ground-Water Hydrology, United States Geological Survey Water-Supply Paper; 2220, 1991.

National Flood Insurance Act of 1968. ([www.fema.gov](http://www.fema.gov))

National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994. ([www.fema.gov](http://www.fema.gov))

Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, California Water Code Division 7. Water Quality. ([ceres.ca.gov](http://ceres.ca.gov))

San Diego Association of Governments, Water Quality Element, Regional Growth Management Strategy, 1997. ([www.sandag.org](http://www.sandag.org))

San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, NPDES Permit No. CAS0108758. ([www.swrcb.ca.gov](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov))

San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin. ([www.swrcb.ca.gov](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov))

#### **LAND USE & PLANNING**

California Department of Conservation Division of Mines and Geology, Open File Report 96-04, Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego County Production Consumption Region, 1996. ([www.consrv.ca.gov](http://www.consrv.ca.gov))

California Environmental Quality Act, CEQA Guidelines, 2003. ([ceres.ca.gov](http://ceres.ca.gov))



California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code 21000-21178; California Code of Regulations, Guidelines for Implementation of CEQA, Appendix G, Title 14, Chapter 3, §15000-15387. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California General Plan Glossary of Terms, 2001. ([ceres.ca.gov](http://ceres.ca.gov))

California State Mining and Geology Board, SP 51, California Surface Mining and Reclamation Policies and Procedures, January 2000. ([www.consrv.ca.gov](http://www.consrv.ca.gov))

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations. ([www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com))

County of San Diego, Board of Supervisors Policy I-84: Project Facility. ([www.sdcountry.ca.gov](http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov))

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-38, as amended 1989. ([www.sdcountry.ca.gov](http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov))

County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use. The Zoning Ordinance of San Diego County. ([www.co.san-diego.ca.us](http://www.co.san-diego.ca.us))

County of San Diego, General Plan as adopted and amended from September 29, 1971 to April 5, 2000. ([ceres.ca.gov](http://ceres.ca.gov))

County of San Diego. Resource Protection Ordinance, compilation of Ord. Nos. 7968, 7739, 7685 and 7631. 1991.

Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego County.

Guide to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) by Michael H. Remy, Tina A. Thomas, James G. Moore, and Whitman F. Manley, Point Arena, CA: Solano Press Books, 1999. ([ceres.ca.gov](http://ceres.ca.gov))

## MINERAL RESOURCES

National Environmental Policy Act, Title 42, 36.401 et. seq. 1969. ([www4.law.cornell.edu](http://www4.law.cornell.edu))

Subdivision Map Act, 2003. ([ceres.ca.gov](http://ceres.ca.gov))

U.S. Geologic Survey, Causey, J. Douglas, 1998, MAS/MILS Mineral Location Database.

U.S. Geologic Survey, Frank, David G., 1999, (MRDS) Mineral Resource Data System.

## NOISE

California State Building Code, Part 2, Title 24, CCR, Appendix Chapter 3, Sound Transmission Control, 1988. . ([www.buildersbook.com](http://www.buildersbook.com))

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 3, Div 6, Chapter 4, Noise Abatement and Control, effective February 4, 1982. ([www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com))

County of San Diego General Plan, Part VIII, Noise Element, effective December 17, 1980. ([ceres.ca.gov](http://ceres.ca.gov))

Federal Aviation Administration, Federal Aviation Regulations, Part 150 Airport Noise Compatibility Planning (revised January 18, 1985). (<http://www.access.gpo.gov/>)

Harris Miller Miller and Hanson Inc., *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment*, April 1995. (<http://ntl.bts.gov/data/rail05/rail05.html>)

International Standard Organization (ISO), ISO 362; ISO 1996 1-3; ISO 3095; and ISO 3740-3747. ([www.iso.ch](http://www.iso.ch))

U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Office of Environment and Planning, Noise and Air Quality Branch. "Highway Traffic Noise Analysis and Abatement Policy and Guidance," Washington, D.C., June 1995. (<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/>)

## POPULATION & HOUSING

Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, 42 USC 5309, Title 42--The Public Health And Welfare, Chapter 69--Community Development, United States Congress, August 22, 1974. ([www4.law.cornell.edu](http://www4.law.cornell.edu))

National Housing Act (Cranston-Gonzales), Title 12, Ch. 13. ([www4.law.cornell.edu](http://www4.law.cornell.edu))

San Diego Association of Governments Population and Housing Estimates, November 2000. ([www.sandag.org](http://www.sandag.org))

US Census Bureau, Census 2000. (<http://www.census.gov/>)

## RECREATION

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 8, Division 10, Chapter PLDO, §810.101 et seq. Park Lands Dedication Ordinance. ([www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com))

## TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

California Aeronautics Act, Public Utilities Code, Section 21001 et seq. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Department of Transportation, Division of Aeronautics, California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook, January 2002.

California Department of Transportation, Environmental Program Environmental Engineering – Noise, Air Quality, and Hazardous Waste Management Office. "Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol for New Highway Construction and Reconstruction Projects," October 1998. ([www.dot.ca.gov](http://www.dot.ca.gov))

California Public Utilities Code, SDCRAA. Public Utilities Code, Division 17, Sections 170000-170084. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Street and Highways Code. California Street and Highways Code, Section 260-283. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

County of San Diego, Alternative Fee Schedules with Pass-By Trips Addendum to Transportation Impact Fee Reports, March 2005. (<http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov/dpw/land/pdf/TransImpactFee/attacha.pdf>)

County of San Diego Transportation Impact Fee Report. January 2005. (<http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov/dpw/permits-forms/manuals.html>)

Fallbrook & Ramona Transportation Impact Fee Report, County of San Diego, January 2005. (<http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov/dpw/permits-forms/manuals.html>)

Office of Planning, Federal Transit Administration, Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment, Final Report, April 1995.

San Diego Association of Governments, 2020 Regional Transportation Plan. Prepared by the San Diego Association of Governments. ([www.sandag.org](http://www.sandag.org))

San Diego Association of Governments, Comprehensive Land Use Plan for Borrego Valley Airport (1986), Brown Field (1995), Fallbrook Community Airpark (1991), Gillespie Field (1989), McClellan-Palomar Airport (1994). ([www.sandag.org](http://www.sandag.org))

US Code of Federal Regulations, Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR), Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace, Title 14, Chapter 1, Part 77. ([www.gpoaccess.gov](http://www.gpoaccess.gov))

#### **UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS**

California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 14. Natural Resources Division, CIWMB Division 7; and Title 27, Environmental Protection Division 2, Solid Waste. ([ccr.oal.ca.gov](http://ccr.oal.ca.gov))

California Integrated Waste Management Act. Public Resources Code, Division 30, Waste Management, Sections 40000-41956. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

County of San Diego, Board of Supervisors Policy I-78: Small Wastewater. ([www.sdcountry.ca.gov](http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov))

Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Annex T Emergency Water Contingencies, October 1992. ([www.co.san-diego.ca.us](http://www.co.san-diego.ca.us))

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service LESA System.

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973.

US Census Bureau, Census 2000.

US Code of Federal Regulations, Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR), Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace, Title 14, Chapter 1, Part 77.

US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) modified Visual Management System.

US Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Visual Impact Assessment for Highway Projects.